1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	Plaintiff, HON. NANCY G. EDMUNDS
5	v. No. 12-20021
6	ADELSO ALEXANDER VICENTE,
7	Defendant.
8	
9	
10	SENTENCING
11	Thursday, July 26, 2012
12	3:20 p.m.
13	APPEARANCES:
14	
15	For the Plaintiff: MATTHEW A. ROTH U.S. Attorney's Office
16	211 West Fort Street Suite 2001
17	Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 226-9100
18	
19	For the Defendant: JUAN A. MATEO Law Offices of Juan A. Mateo
20	535 Griswold Suite 1000
21	Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 962-3500
22	
23	
24	To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact:
25	Leann S. Lizza, CSR-3746, RPR, CRR, RMR, CRC, RDR (313) 234-2608

Rearing	1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Statement by Mr. Manzo	2	Hearing	<u>Page</u>
5 Allocution by Mr. Mateo 8 6 Reply by Mr. Roth 11 7 Statement by Mr. Vicente 14 8 Imposition of sentence by the Court 15 9 (None offered.) 10 11 Exhibits: Received 12 (None offered.) 10 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	3	Sentencing	3
6 Reply by Mr. Roth 11 7 Statement by Mr. Vicente 14 8 Imposition of sentence by the Court 15 9 10 11 Exhibits: Received (None offered.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4	Statement by Mr. Manzo	7
Statement by Mr. Vicente	5	Allocution by Mr. Mateo	8
8 Imposition of sentence by the Court 15 9 10 11 Exhibits: Received 12 (None offered.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	6	Reply by Mr. Roth	11
9 10 Exhibits: Received 12 (None offered.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 16 17 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	7	Statement by Mr. Vicente	14
11	8	Imposition of sentence by the Court	15
Exhibits: Received (None offered.) Received (None offered.) Received (None offered.)	9		
12 (None offered.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	10		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	11	Exhibits:	<u>Received</u>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	12	(None offered.)	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	14		
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	15		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	16		
 19 20 21 22 23 24 	17		
 20 21 22 23 24 	18		
 21 22 23 24 	19		
222324	20		
23 24	21		
24			
	23		
25	24		
	25		

3

```
July 26, 2012
 1
 2
                                           Detroit, Michigan
 3
 4
         (Court, Counsel and Defendant present.)
 5
         (Call to order of the Court, 3:20 p.m.)
 6
              THE COURT CLERK: All rise. Court is in session.
 7
              THE COURT: Be seated.
              THE COURT CLERK: The Court calls the case United
 8
 9
     States versus Adelso Vicente, case Number 12-20021. Place your
10
     appearances on the record, please.
11
              MR. ROTH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Matthew Roth
12
    on behalf of the United States.
13
              MR. MATEO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Juan Mateo
14
     appearing on behalf of Mr. Vicente who stands to my left. Your
15
    Honor, he needs the assistance of a translator and in that role
16
     is Laura Hein who is also to my left.
17
         (Laura Hein, Interpreter, sworn, 3:21 p.m.)
18
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
              MR. ROTH: Your Honor, if I may for a moment, the
19
20
    victim's father is here and does not speak English. We also
21
    have a translator for him so that he can follow the
22
    proceedings. With the Court's permission, back there, if the
23
    Court sees her talking to him, it would seem to be because
24
    she's translating the proceedings to him as well.
25
              THE COURT: No problem. Thank you.
```

1 MR. ROTH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This is the date and time set for sentencing in this matter. Mr. Mateo, have you reviewed the presentence investigation report with Mr. Vicente?

MR. MATEO: Yes, I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And there is a dispute with respect to the cross-reference applied by the government at the time of the plea agreement and then not applied by the probation office.

Perhaps I should let Mr. Roth speak to that first since it is part of the plea agreement. So you agreed to it initially.

Probation discounts it. But Mr. Roth, why don't you go ahead and speak to it now, and then I'll have you, Mr. Mateo.

MR. MATEO: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. ROTH: Your Honor, the issue before the Court is under Section 2G1.3(c)(1). There's a cross-reference which indicates that if the offense involved causing a minor, and I'll paraphrase, to engage in sexually explicit conduct for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct, Section 2G2.1 is to be scored. The cross-reference indicates that the higher of 2G2.1 or 2G1.3 will be the controlling guideline range. The application though indicates that cross-reference is to be construed broadly and specifically includes all instances in which the offense involved employing, using, persuaded or inducing an individual minor to engage in sexually explicit conduct.

As the Court knows, sexually explicit conduct includes and is defined under 18 U.S.C. 2256(2)(A) as a lascivious display of the genital or pubic area of any person.

There is no question in this case, Your Honor, that during the conversations through the phone and through the Internet the defendant asked the victim on multiple occasions to send him sexually explicit images of her engaged in sexually explicit conduct. I would refer the Court to the PSR in paragraph 9 which is located on page 5 where it reflects the fact that the defendant made these requests, and without extrapolating further page 5, section paragraph 8 indicates what she did in response to that request.

Based on that I think that there really is no question that those requests were made, that it was at his insistence, his persistence, I think, is what ultimately caused her to do it.

The government submitted four cases out of the Seventh, Ninth, Third and Tenth Circuits that essentially speak to this issue and show that, in fact, this does apply. Tenth Circuit specifically referenced the fact that even if the pictures were not taken, it was the solicitation before those pictures that triggers the cross-reference. For those reasons we believe it's applicable; that is why we calculated 168 to 210 months in the Rule 11 plea agreement.

THE COURT: Mr. Mateo?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MATEO: Your Honor, I agree that in the Rule 11 plea agreement we contemplated that those were the accurate guidelines, and I guess the question is do you adopt what we've done or do you adopt what the probation department has done. In responding to the probation department's report, I note in my reply brief to the government's sentencing memorandum that our position is they waive any objection they have to that calculation.

THE COURT: Well, I have to tell you, I would accept the plea agreement as originally written anyway. I think it's clear that the cross-reference applies. Whether the government filed a timely objection to the recommendation of the probation department or not seems very clear to me that the cross-reference applies in this case. I mean the record is replete with instances in which the defendant urged the victim to send explicit pictures, then he took more pictures during their encounters together. I don't think there's any question that the cross-reference applies.

MR. MATEO: Your Honor, if I may only note that the cases that were relied on by the government I think are distinguishable and I think as I understand how the cases interpret that guideline is was the defendant involved in some sort of process of trying to generate child pornography, and I wrote in my reply brief how I distinguished those cases and I just want to make sure the record is clear that I've done that.

```
1
              THE COURT: I understood that position. I just don't
 2
     agree with it.
 3
              MR. MATEO:
                          I appreciate it.
 4
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you, Mr. Mateo.
 5
              Any other issues with respect to the presentence
 6
    report, Mr. Mateo or Mr. Roth?
 7
              MR. MATEO: No, Your Honor.
              MR. ROTH: No, Your Honor.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Mateo, is there anything that you'd
     like to say -- well, let me ask first, I understand that the
10
11
     victim's father is in the courtroom. Did he want to make a
     statement or is he just here to --
12
13
             MR. ROTH: He did want to make a statement, yes, Your
14
    Honor.
15
              THE COURT: This would be an appropriate time for him
16
    to do that.
17
                        May he approach with the translator?
18
              THE COURT: Please.
19
              MR. ROTH: For the record, Your Honor, his name is
20
     Salvador Manzo, M-A-N-Z-O.
21
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Manzo.
22
              MR. MANZO: Good afternoon.
23
              THE COURT: I'm happy to hear what you have to say.
24
              MR. MANZO: I just want to let you know that this has
     separated and split my family because of what he did, and in
```

```
addition to that, I wouldn't want him to do to other families
 2
     what he did to mine.
 3
              THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
              MR. MANZO: You're welcome.
 5
              THE COURT: Mr. Mateo, is there anything you'd like to
 6
     say on behalf of the defendant before I impose sentence?
 7
              MR. MATEO:
                          Yes, Your Honor. May I approach the
 8
    podium?
 9
              THE COURT: Please.
10
              MR. MATEO: Your Honor, we filed a sentencing
11
    memorandum under seal and attached to that memorandum were
12
    various letters of references and most importantly is a report
13
    written by Dr. William Nixon who has evaluated Mr. Vicente.
14
    And in addressing the sentencing factors that you need to
15
    address, Your Honor, I will start with them and start with
16
     factor A by the nature and circumstances of the offense and the
```

history and characteristics of the defendant. Your Honor, he

17

23

24

29 years old, who has no prior criminal history, and I think

Court to at least look at is the fact that he is a young man of

his psychiatric makeup is critical in order for you to

S

understand why he did what he did.

Dr. Nixon finds that he is an extremely immature young man. He is immature by way of life's experiences and he is immature by way of sexual experiences. There is no question that he should have known better than to engage in the ongoing contact that he did with this 13-year-old young lady. But it is also very clear that both of them engaged in this ongoing dialogue and that she invited him into the state of Michigan. Any other individual of any type of maturity level would have not done this.

The question, I think, that's very critical is is he a pedophile. Is he the type of individual who is seeking out, you know, minors of -- for sexual gratification. I think Dr. Nixon's report is very clear on that, that he is not, that he got involved in this because of his lack of maturity. He has -- I think he's had only three experiences with sexual activity involving other women. This was his third.

He is an only child. He left home when he was only 13 years old. He has been in the United States, working for the past nine years, and isolated in Palo Alto, California. It doesn't excuse his conduct, Judge, but I think it puts his conduct into a certain context that is supported by the findings of Dr. Nixon, that we're here because of his level of immaturity or lack thereof and we're here because he, when he should have known better, continued to engage in this conduct

and is now facing a very serious penalty.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

With regard to the factor as far as your sentence is concerned to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense, I understand the government's recommendation is 135 The statutory minimum here is 120 months. I think, Your Honor, that a ten-year sentence does reflect the seriousness of the offense and would promote respect for the law. I think anyone who is mature enough or even somebody with his kind of background would understand, you can't engage in this conduct. And he's already done approximately 290 days or so. He is facing another sentence regarding the underlying matter in the state court of Macomb County Circuit Court. I believe the recommendation in that case is going to be a fiveto fifteen-year sentence. And so I think a sentence in the range of 120 months, it is more than adequate to address that factor.

The factor regarding adequate deterrence from criminal conduct, Your Honor, the same comments I made I think apply to that.

The factor regarding the protecting the public from any future crimes from Mr. Vicente. Mr. Vicente has no prior criminal history, has never been involved in any crimes of violence, and he will be deported after he serves his time in this case, and I think a sentence that we're recommending

```
1
    adequately addresses that.
 2
              The factor regarding a need for educational or
 3
    vocational training, I don't think there are any factors that
    really apply to that other than to indicate that he has limited
 4
 5
     education and any training would be something that he could
 6
    make do or make use of, but I think because of his immigration
 7
    status, Your Honor, he is not going to be afforded any of that
 8
    type of training.
 9
              The bottom line, Judge, he is going to -- the other
     factors, I don't think, apply. The bottom line is he's going
10
11
     to be facing a very serious sentence, whatever you do, and I'm
    asking the Court that you do what -- what we've recommended.
12
13
    think a ten-year sentence for this offense is more than
14
    adequate and is reasonable and it's sufficient to punish him
15
     for what he has done.
16
              THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Mateo.
              Mr. Roth?
17
18
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. ROTH:
19
              May I approach the podium?
20
              THE COURT: Please.
```

MR. ROTH: Thank you.

Your Honor, I want to begin by telling the Court that
we do not challenge Dr. Nixon's conclusion that the defendant
is not -- is not a pedophile. This seems to be more of a

21

22

23

24

SENTENCING

willing to engage him in these conversations and pursued the individual more so than specifically a child. However, there are definitely some issues that concern the government.

In Dr. Nixon's report on page 3, the defendant makes a comment that he thought the parents were in agreement and that she was going to live with him and they were going to live together. I don't think that there's any question in this case in the facts that that's not an accurate statement. There's no way he could have thought that the parents thought that this was going to be a situation where they were okay with. He talked with her in a secret manner. He never went to the house. He waited for her to go to school. When she got off the school bus, he picked her up. There is nothing at all that would support that conclusion. And I don't know if that's the immaturity that Dr. Nixon cites or that it is somebody who is trying to minimize culpability. But nevertheless, I think it's important to point out that that's not a truthful statement.

I think the most concerning thing is Dr. Nixon's conclusion where he indicated that the defendant is a moderate risk to seek attention from females with little regard as to the consequences of his actions, and I think that diagnosis really hits the nail on the head and really points to why this individual presents a danger. I think the doctor was right, the defendant exhibited significant recklessness. He totally disregarded the age of the victim. He had very -- he had

SENTENCING

tunnel vision. What he saw was a female who was willing to engage him in this relationship and regardless of his age -- of her age, he decided he was going to move forward. He also acknowledged that he recognized that what he wanted to do and what he did do was illegal and that he knew he was to wait until she was 18 years old. But, again, as Dr. Nixon said, little regard to the consequences. He absolutely went forward even knowing what he did was illegal.

There's also recklessness in the fact the way he did it. Engaged in the acts he did without protection puts the victim at severe risk not only because of her age but physically. We talk about concerns about pregnancy and diseases and so forth. I think there's no question that the only reason he came here was to engage in these acts with the victim. When he picked her up in front of the school, he immediately took her to the motel where a room that he had already checked out that he already had booked. There's no question what his purpose was. He talks about loving her and caring for her but really what it came down to is the second he could get his hands on her, he took her to the motel where he had a room waiting. That also is concern to the government.

And, finally, another issue that's important for the Court to know, in this case the defendant was very persistent. The victim did not acquiesce to pictures and to relationship and to the sexual acts immediately. It was a constant barrage

SENTENCING

of requests over and over again. It was "if you love me, then this; if you love me, then that." I'm not standing before the Court indicating that the victim was not complicit in portions of this. But, again, the victim is a 13-year-old child of which he knew and it was this persistence that I think at the end of the day got her and him to where they ended up at the time that they were arrested.

So we talk about deterrence, and we talk about punishment which are important, but in this case we have somebody who deterrence doesn't necessarily seem to be an issue, as Dr. Nixon points out. Little regard to the consequences of his actions, and as the facts point out, he didn't care age, consequences or anything. He did what he wanted to do. He was like a missile that honed in on her and struck as soon as he could. And that's the reason why we don't think 120 months is appropriate. We think a stronger sentence of 135 months is appropriate.

THE COURT: Mr. Vicente, is there anything you'd like to say on your behalf before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. First, I would like to ask to forgive me to Maria Manzo, also to Maria's parents. It wasn't my intention to commit this offense, and I know I committed this offense. I know I shouldn't have sent any pictures, also no messages and no e-mails because I knew it was an offense. But I did it, and that's why I'm here. And I hope I can be

SENTENCING

forgiven for the crime I commit. It was never my intention to damage Maria, neither to her parents, Maria's parents, neither the public nor the state. I had already an experience in jail and I know it's nothing good, not to be in jail, even worse in prison. And I already have now an experience not to do this crime again. And they can forgive me, Your Honor, for this.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Vicente.

Well, with the cross-reference in this case, the guidelines are actually 168 to 210 months although without the cross-reference they're 120 to 135. Government's only asking for the top of the noncross-reference guideline range, the 135. The guidelines, of course, are advisory. They're not mandatory, although the ten-year minimum is mandatory in this case. But the Court is directed under 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a) to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the statutory objectives.

The Court is directed, first, to look at the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. In this case the defendant -- I have to agree with the government's characterization here. It seems he had tunnel vision without any regard for the consequences. Whether it was a result of immaturity or some psychological lapse or whatever, he honed in on a 13-year-old girl and badgered her persistently until she was willing to submit naked pictures of herself and engage in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENTENCING

```
sexual acts which were far beyond her maturity and which were
physically painful and degrading. And apparently, as I
understand this, he was apprehended as a result of a sting
involving another victim, another potential victim. I don't
know how far that went but -- no?
         MR. ROTH: No, Your Honor. This -- he was arrested
because the child was missing and they were looking for the
particular child.
         THE COURT: Ah.
         MR. ROTH: And I think they had an idea the vehicle
which he had driven and that's how they honed in on this.
         THE COURT:
                    Oh.
         MR. ROTH: There's no evidence that we know that there
was any other victims involved.
         THE COURT: But he traveled from California to
Michigan on two separate occasions to entice the victim to have
sex with him. He was successful on his second attempt.
that is not a casual and incidental encounter.
something that obsessed him over a substantial period of time
and which took considerable effort to undertake and achieve.
don't know that he can be deterred.
         I accept Dr. Nixon's analysis that he's not a
            We've certainly seen enough pedophiles in this
court and Dr. Nixon has seen enough pedophiles that he would
```

know if he is. But there is something seriously problematic

SENTENCING

with this young man that hopefully can be addressed as a matter of deterrence with a lengthy custody sentence which he'll get whether I give him the ten-year mandatory minimum or the 135 months the government is requesting.

And I believe that the government's request is the appropriate sentence in this case given the serious physical nature of this offense and the effort that it took on behalf of this defendant to achieve this, the mindset that had to have been there for this to have happened this way. Seems to me that the top of the guideline range is the more appropriate place to go.

So on Count 1 of the information, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the Court, considering the sentencing guidelines and factors contained in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), hereby commits the defendant to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons for a term of 135 months.

Upon release from imprisonment, Defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years. It's further ordered that the defendant pay a special assessment of \$100 which would be due immediately.

The Court waives the imposition of a fine, the costs of incarceration and cost of supervision due to the defendant's lack of financial resources.

While on supervision, Defendant shall abide by the standard conditions adopted by the Court and with the following

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

SENTENCING

special conditions. Due to the defendant's personal history and the characteristics of the instant offense, the following conditions are ordered. Defendant shall comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act as directed by the probation officer, the United States Bureau of Prisons or any state sex offender registration agency in which he resides, works, is a student or was convicted of a qualifying offense. Defendant shall only access the Internet through one Internet-capable device. All other Internet capable devices such as cellular phones and gaming consoles shall not have the Internet connected. The defendant is prohibited from accessing any online computer service at any location including but not limited to public libraries, Internet cafes and places of employment or education without the permission of the probation officer. Defendant shall not have contact directly or indirectly with any victim or witness in the instant offense unless approved by the probation officer.

Defendant shall not associate with minor children under the age of 18 except in the presence of a responsibile adult who is aware of the nature of his background and current events and who has been approved by the probation officer.

Defendant shall not frequent places where children congregate on a regular basis such as but not limited to school grounds, playgrounds, child toy stores, video arcades and the like.

```
1
              Mr. Vicente, you have -- I don't think you have the
 2
     right to appeal the sentence. It is within the guideline
 3
     range.
             To the extent that there is any appealable issue, it
 4
    would have to be filed within ten days.
 5
              Mr. Roth?
 6
                        Your Honor, we'd ask the Court to impose a
              MR. ROTH:
 7
    no contact order with the victim and the victim's family for
 8
     the duration of the time he is on supervised release.
 9
                          I thought I said that, but if I didn't --
              THE COURT:
                               You said victim or witness.
10
              THE COURT CLERK:
11
              THE COURT: Victim or witness or victim's family.
12
              MR. ROTH:
                        Thank you, Your Honor.
                               Designation?
13
              THE COURT CLERK:
14
              THE COURT: Do you want any kind of designation,
15
    Mr. Mateo?
16
              MR. MATEO:
                          I'm sorry.
17
              THE COURT: Any place of confinement designated?
18
                          I was just going to ask the Court to
              MR. MATEO:
19
     recommend a facility in the Palo Alto, California area.
20
              THE COURT: I'll ask for something in northern
21
    California, if possible.
22
              MR. MATEO: Thank you.
23
              THE COURT: Are there any objections to the sentence
     just pronounced other than what's already been stated on the
24
     record, Mr. Roth?
```

```
1
              MR. ROTH: No, Your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT: Mr. Mateo?
 3
              MR. MATEO: No, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Good
 5
     luck, Mr. Vicente.
 6
              MR. ROTH: Thank you, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT CLERK: Court stands in recess.
 8
         (Proceedings concluded, 3:48 p.m.)
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

SENTENCING

1	CERTIFICATION OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, Leann S. Lizza, do hereby certify that the above-entitled
4	matter was taken before me at the time and place hereinbefore
5	set forth; that the proceedings were duly recorded by me
6	stenographically and reduced to computer transcription; that
7	this is a true, full and correct transcript of my stenographic
8	notes so taken; and that I am not related to, nor of counsel to
9	either party, nor interested in the event of this cause.
10	
11	
12	<u>S/Leann S. Lizza</u> 8-15-2019
13	Leann S. Lizza, CSR-3746, RPR, CRR, RMR, RDR Date
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	